Approved For Release 2007/05/24 : CIA-RDP84B00049R001002430013-3

## Committee on Foreign Affairs PURPOSE

This study will examine why U.S. efforts to interdict the increasing flow of drugs into the U.S. are having little success, and what the Congress and the rest of the U.S. Government can do about it.

## SCOPE

Following would be the principal topics and questions to be examined by the study.

Organization. Who is doing what with regard to our international narcotics control policy? Is there a mechanism to ensure sufficient high level attention within the White House, the State Department and our Embassies abroad? Have responsibilities been handed out in a clear and logical fashion to the appropriate agency or official, with sufficient resources and know-how to get the job done? Are the agencies cooperating fully and sharing all necessary information and resources with one another, in particular with regard to intelligence gathering?

Policy. Does the United States have a clear and coherent foreign policy strategy on international narcotics control? What has the Reagan Administration enunciated on this subject thus far? Is the keystone of our policy still crop eradication at the source? To what extent if any is it necessary to couple crop eradication with income substitution programs? Should the funds for such programs be channeled through AID or some other entity? What factors impair U.S. credibility with foreign governments concerning eradication such as the Percy Amendment, failure to eradicate domestically, etc? Are the complicated circumstances in all source countries such that cost-effective eradication efforts are not possible? Where is crop eradication feasible, if anywhere, and why? Does our policy give a different priority to heroin, cocaine, marijuana, licit drugs, chemicals? Should the Congress give any new policy directives to the executive branch on narcotics matters?

Priority and Resources. What is the real priority of international narcotics control in the White House, the State Department and our embassies abroad? Is it adequate to ensure the reasonable success of our policy and strategy? How receptive are the regional bureaus and the Secretary's Office at State to narcotics considerations? How receptive are U.S. Ambassadors and country teams? Is there any way to improve the situation? Is the U.S. international Marcotics control program adequately funded? Is the U.S. throwing money at a problem and not getting adequate results? What are adequate results? Is the international side of narcotics control getting its fair share of all narcotics control funds?